

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,694	09/30/2004	Hunter L. Reap	014862-000001	5693
24239	7590 04/06/2006		EXAMINER	
MOORE & VAN ALLEN PLLC			DOE, GRACE SC	
P.O. BOX 13706 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Ç ,			3732	
			DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_
1:
v
$\overline{}$

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/711,694	REAP, HUNTER L.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Grace SC Doe	3732				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 S	eptember 2004.					
,	action is non-final.	•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, pr	osecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	.53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.		•				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement	•				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, stocker requirement					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
·	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Offic	e Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 		a)-(d) or (f).				
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received in Applica	tion No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pricapplication from the International Burea	•	ved in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ved.				
		• •				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar	y (PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/28/05</u>. 	Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/711,694 Page 2

Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

- 1. The references listed in Applicant's information disclosure statement filed on 1/28/05 is acknowledged and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With regards to claim 1, the language "at all relative positions of the projection and the tooth" is vague. Please clarify.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Linet (US 2,634,501). Linet discloses a dental tool having a substantially planar base (See figure

Art Unit: 3732

5, part 23) capable of extending over adjacent teeth (See figure 10) and projection extending therefrom (See figure 3, part 17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-3, 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochis (US 4,526,542) in view of Linet (2,634,501). Kochis discloses a dental tool having a substantially planar base (See figure 1, part 41) and projection extending therefrom (See figure 2, part 31). Kochis fails to indicate that the base is capable of extending over adjacent teeth. Linet discloses a base capable of extending over adjacent teeth (See figure 10) in order to enable parallel gauge measurements (See col. 1, lines 43-55; col. 2, lines 20-24). Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the tool of Kochis with the base of Caldwell in order to enable parallel gauge measurements (See col. 1, lines 43-55; col. 2, lines 20-24). Kochis further discloses that the projection extends less than 2 mm (See col. 2, lines 55-56). The tool includes a handle integral with the base (See figure 1, part 42). The language of claim 7 regarding marking instrument is refers to intended use, bearing little patentable weight on the claim. Kochis in view of Linet, further discloses a method using

Application/Control Number: 10/711,694

Art Unit: 3732

the dental tool discussed above by placing the projection adjacent a tooth face (See Kochis figure 10; col. 2, lines 65-68; col. 3, lines 1-2) and planar surface over immediate adjacent teeth (See Linet figure 10), moving the tool so the projection engages the tooth (See Kochis figure 10; col. 2, lines 65-68; col. 3, lines 1-2), and placing carbon between the projection and the tooth (See col. 3, lines 33-34; col. 2, lines 65-68; col. 3, lines 1-2).

8. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochis (US 4,526,542), in view of Linet (2,634,501), and further in view of Littleton (US 3,006,011). Kochis, discussed above, fails to disclose a connecting means capable of allowing the handle to move relative to the base. Littleton discloses a handle with a universal joint (See col. 1, 12-16) in order to allow the base to be swiveled in all directions (See col. 2, lines 41-43). The language of claim 6 is analyzed as means plus function because it meets the 3-prong analysis: (1) the claim limitation must use the phrase "means for" or "step for"; (2) the "means for" or "step for" must be modified by functional language; and (3) the phrase "means for" or "step for" must not be modified by sufficient structure, material, or acts for achieving the specified function. (Supplement Examination Guidelines Regarding 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 6 (65 Federal Register 38510 June 21, 2000)). The disclosed connecting means, universal joint, is an equivalent of the Applicant's universal joint because the prior art element is a structural equivalent of the corresponding element disclosed in the specification. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Littleton is considered analogous art since it reasonably pertains to the problem in which Applicant is interested, facilitate

Art Unit: 3732

manipulation a dental tool. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the tool of Kochis in view of Linet with the joint of Littleton in order to facilitate positioning of the base (See col. 2, lines 41-43). Littleton also teaches a means for removable connecting the base and handle (See col. 3, lines 1-3). The language of claim 8 is analyzed as means plus function. The disclosed removable connecting means, removal of the swivel element from the base socket, is an equivalent of the Applicant's slidablely removable flange, since a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the interchangeability of the element shown in the prior art for the corresponding element disclosed in the specification. Caterpillar Inc. v. Deere & Co., 224 F.3d 1374, 56 USPQ2d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2000). In both instances, the joint performs the same function, detaching the base from the handle for similar purposes, cleaning and disposal.

Conclusion

- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- A. US 2,224,264 (Jeanneret) discloses a dental cutting tool having a base and projection.
- B. US 3,011,256 (Baum) discloses a dental cutting tool having a base and projection.

Application/Control Number: 10/711,694

Art Unit: 3732

C. US 5,779,476 (Roetzer) disclose a dental abrading tool having a base and projection.

- D. US 6,390,814 (Gardiner) discloses a dental cutting tool having a base and projection.
- E. US 4,177,565 (Heasley) discloses a dental cutting tool having a base and projection.
- F. US 4,738,621 (Lowder) discloses a dental cutting tool having a base and projection.

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 10/711,694 Page 7

Art Unit: 3732

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Grace SC Doe whose telephone number is (571) 272-2831. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P. Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Grace SC Doe

Examiner Art Unit 3732

(571) 272-2831

John J. Wilson Primary Examiner